

## STATE OF CONNECTICUT







DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

John A. Danaher III Commissioner Lieutenant Edwin S. Henion Chief of Staff

February 18, 2009

Rep. Brendan Sharkey, Co-Chairman Sen. Eric D. Coleman, Co-Chairman Planning and Development Committee Legislative Office Building Hartford, CT 06106

## HB 5864 AN ACT CONCERNING REMISSION OF FUNDS TO MUNICIPALITIES FOR TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS

The Department of Public Safety is opposed to this bill.

This bill would amend the General Statutes to require that fifteen per cent of the amount of each fine paid for state and local motor vehicle violations, including speeding, be remitted to the municipality in which the violation took place. Public Act 06-106 provided for remission of a surcharge on certain motor vehicle violations to the municipality in which they occurred. That public act amended CGS 51-56a to provide for an additional fee of \$10 to be paid to the municipality in which the violation occurred for the following violations: sections 14-218a, 14-219, 14-222, 14-223, 14-227a, sections 14-230 to 14-240, inclusive, as amended, sections 14-241 to 14-249, inclusive, section 14-279 for the first offense, sections 14-289b, 14-299, 14-301 to 14-303. Given the state's current economic outlook and the additional diversion of state revenue that would result from this bill, the Department of Public Safety must oppose HB 5864.

In fact, the department would prefer to see an amendment to the current statute regarding the issue of payment to municipalities for motor vehicle violations occurring within their borders to obviate a possibly unintended result of Public Act 06-106. When arrests for motor vehicle violations are made on limited access highways, those arrests are made by state police officers, whose training, salaries and necessary equipment is paid for by the State of Connecticut. An arrest made on a limited access highway may be within the boundaries of a municipality, but all public safety costs are borne by the State of Connecticut and there is no

nexus or public policy reason for any percentage of fees or even the additional fees provided for in Public Act 06-106 to be given to the municipality in which the violation occurred. Those funds should go to the general fund.

Sincerely,

John A. Danaher III COMMISSIONER